

any if "you had 500 slaves you would set them free." The reason you would not, is that you are a slaveholder. D. D. says: "If I don't keep them they will be liable to be taken up by some other person, and they may fall into bad hands, and be worse off than they are now." This, I believe, is the amount of the argument which professors of religion make use of to justify themselves in holding slaves. Let us then take this argument and apply it to the temperance cause and see how it looks there. We may be a little prejudiced for or against slavery, and not be able to see it in its true light. I will suppose then, that you profess to be a temperance man, and that your temperance principles are made of the same, or a better stuff than your anti-slavery principles, a d. what will be the consequence? Why the consequence will be the same. Will drink what alcohol you can for fear it will fall into the hands of a worse man—would it not be better to have it drunk directly by a good man than to have it fall into the hands of a drunkard? Now if the argument is good for holding slaves—it is good for drinking what whiskey you can to keep it from worse men. But the truth most valuable for the anti-slavery cause which your speech contains, is in these words: "We are now placed in such a position that we cannot speak our anti-slavery sentiments." There is a previous acknowledgment to come from a slaveholder D. D. Abolitionists have always contended that the slaveholder's soul was enslaved—that he durst not speak his sentiments; but this has been, and still is strongly denied by many. We are glad then to have the testimony of the Rev. Dr. Hill in this case; let it be recorded, that the said Rev. Dr. testified in the New York General Assembly, in the year of our Lord 1843, that he, the said D. D. and others "cannot speak their anti-slavery sentiments." This I suppose, means cannot without giving offence;—we are bound to give it this qualification or it would plainly be untrue. It appears that the assembly condemn the practice of drinking, but I have no doubt but they would have done more towards doing away with it, if they had struck a blow at the great slave trade, and weakened that a little, for when that falls, thousands who now live on plunder will have to get their bread by the sweat of their brow, and consequently will not have much time or inclination to dance. I had supposed that the assembly met to devise ways and means for carrying on the war against Satan, but it seems you fear it will disturb his peace to say or do anything that would deprive him of the benefit of slavery, and I have no doubt but it would be so long as he can persuade men that they can be good Christians, at the same time they are robbing their neighbors of all they possess, so long will he be sure of some prey; he will care but little whether a man dances or not, if he can only get him to steal his neighbor, and rob him of all he possesses, and then (so far as in him lies) murder his soul; his purpose will be accomplished, for

His business is, if right I scan
To ruin fallen, guilty man.
Be entreated then, dear sir, to keep a good look out for him, for "the goeth about like a roaring lion seeking whom he may devour"—he has many traps and uses divers kinds of bait. When he feels anxious to catch

A tit'd man of church or state,
He baits his trap with negro hate.
A few questions, and I will close. Do you feel in any danger of suffering in any way, in consequence of your anti-slavery principles? Does your church see that you are well provided with all the good things of this world? surely you ought to be sumptuously every day." If a minister of the gospel "durst not speak his anti-slavery sentiments," how can the world know that he speaks the sentiments of his heart on any other subject? If you are not deceived, and are in fact an anti-slavery man, be so good as to tell us what a pro-slavery man is. If a man, who sends his negro's horse down the Penitentiary, how can that man be a Christian, who robs him of his life? Please publish your opinion on these queries, and by so doing you may

Help us all to see the heart,
And save the soul that better part.
LUTHER BROWN.
ELLSWORTH, Trumbull Co., O., July 4, 1843.

THE PHILANTHROPIST.

EDITED BY G. BAILEY, JR.

CINCINNATI.

Wednesday, August 2, 1843.

More Ecclesiastical Folly.

The "Spirit of Missions," a periodical in New York, edited for the Board of Missions of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, was in raptures on the appearance of the letter of Mr. McDonough, of Louisiana. His effort to make slavery profitable, Mr. Harris, its editor, styled "a work of practical Christianity;" and then Mr. McDonough himself, he said, "the knew none more deserving the homage of the gods;" "his reward awaited him in Heaven;" "his praise will doubtless be in the church above!" It is difficult to have charity for a man, so stupid or so dishonest, as to utter such nonsense as this. The "practical Christianity" of this man consisted, in so applying the stimulus of prospective freedom in exile, to his slaves, as to make them yield enough by their extra labor, to enable him to stock his plantation with twice their number of fresh hands at the end of fifteen years.—If the praise of men, who coin money out of the blood and sweat of their fellows, is to be in the church above, doubtless Mr. McDonough will be highly lauded there. This same Mr. Harris was shamelessly enough to propose that "slaves should be purchased by churches for the support of a Mission school in Louisiana, to be worked on the cent percent plan of the saint McDonough, whose honored name he proposed should be given to this institution of the church."

As might have been expected, the editor of this church paper, was severely castigated by certain of his own brethren; and at a late meeting of the Episcopal Board of Missions in Boston, his conduct was formally brought to the notice of the Convention, by a memorial from the vestry of Zion's church, Mendon, Illinois.

A writer in the National Anti-slavery Standard copies from the Liberator an extract of a sketch of the debate on this memorial.

"Judge HUNTINGTON, of Connecticut, moved that the memorial be referred to the committee on 'The Spirit of Missions.'"

Rev. Dr. VINCENT, of Boston, was in favor of the proposed reference; not because he wished to see the church agitated by the abolition excitement, for no one would deprecate such agitation more than himself, but because he thought that petitions from any branch of the church, if respectful in their tone, should be received and treated with courtesy.

Some other person moved to amend, by referring the letter to one of the missionary committees.

Bishop DOANE, of New Jersey, said the subject of abolition was one with which the board of missions had nothing to do; and he therefore hoped the letter would not be referred at all. He moved a resolution, to the effect that as the subject of the petition was one the cognizance of

which did not come within the duties of the board, the petitioners have leave to withdraw.—He did not think the matter was entitled to any other notice.

The Bishop of Maryland, WHITTINGHAM, was for acting in the most summary manner, and giving the petitioners leave at once to withdraw. Judge HUNTINGTON was very desirous that the petition should be referred. He was no friend to abolition, but he did respect the right of petition. Congress had done much to promote excitement, by refusing to receive petitions. Had the first petition for the abolition of slavery been received and referred, and their prayer refused on proper grounds, all agitation would have ceased long ago. He wished to have this petition referred, not to promote excitement, but as the most effectual way of preventing it.

It was contended by several, that the editor of the Spirit of Missions was alone responsible for what he wrote; and therefore, that no action could be rightfully asked of the board. But others said that this was not generally understood, and that some public announcement was needed, to satisfy those who complained.

The motion of Bishop DOANE finally prevailed, and the petitioners had leave to withdraw.

The next day, however, a memorial from the Hon. William Jay was presented by Bishop Eastburn, on the same subject; and it is stated the board saw proper to reconsider their action, and refer both memorials to a committee.

The "Churchman" gives the following account of the matter.

"A second memorial on the subject of some editorial remarks in the March number of the Spirit of Missions, was presented and read, on Thursday morning. This memorial gave rise to a long and animated discussion, which was terminated on Friday forenoon; when it was resolved, that this board deems itself entrusted only with the missionary work of the church, and as it is not responsible for editorial remarks in the Spirit of Missions, it therefore does not consider the communication on the subject of editorial remarks in the March number of the Spirit of Missions, as coming within the proper duty of the board."

It is said that Mr. Harris, during the discussion proffered an apology, but it came too late for his reputation.

It was also ordered that "a statement be printed upon the cover of the 'Spirit of Missions,' during the coming year, that the board are not responsible for the private expressions of opinion on the part of the editor."

This will not save the Board. Were the editor to express his own private opinions in favor of polygamy, or horse-racing, or lotteries, or community of wives, we suppose all disclaimers on the part of the Board, of responsibility for these opinions, would not avail them in the eyes of the world, so long as they retained such an editor at the head of their chief paper.

The proceedings in the case show what little conscience these "right reverend" gentlemen have on the subject of man-stealing.

The Work Progressing.

If we are to believe the report of some, our great men are rapidly growing in grace. We have the authority of the reverend editor of the Christian Advocate for saying, that Henry Clay is a pretty good sort of a religious kind of a man, reading the Bible, attending church, &c.—And now we learn from an article copied in the Washington Globe, that the hero of New Orleans, has grown pious. "Since his return to the Hermitage, his life has, in all its aspects, been that of an exemplary Christian." So runs the record—and indeed, says the discerning biographer, "Jackson's spirit seems like that of Nelson, to have been naturally devout!"

We should now be pleased to hear about Daniel Webster and Martin Van Buren. Who knows, but the next news may be, that they have joined the church! We confess we should have more faith in these men walking "humbly before God," if we could see any evidences that they had learned "to do justly and love mercy."

Fugitive Slaves.

Recent legal proceedings have directed much attention to the subject of the rights and duties of the slaves in relation to flight, and the rights and duties of anti-slavery citizens in regard to escaping fugitives.

Slaves must submit, fight, or flee. If they submit, their submission is urged against them by many, as proof positive of their unfitness for freedom. If they should fight, the whole power of the Union would be arrayed against them, and the result would be disastrous in the extreme.

Flight is their only resource, but the home thus secured is an uncomfortable one, and at best, it is a resource within the reach of but few.

Is it the right of the slave to escape? Even the slave-owner will not deny this.

Is it his duty? This depends on circumstances. Some conventions have passed resolutions declaring it his duty. The use of such resolutions, is doubtful: their truth, contingent.

A slave has a wife and children in bondage;—their only consolation is, the privilege of seeing each other, and sorrowing with each other. The presence of the husband, slave as he is, is a blessing to the wife, a joy to the children. Shall he leave them, to bear alone their burthen? Shall he leave them, and add to their misery, the agonizing thought that they are deserted by the only one of all earth's millions, who pined them, and prayed for their welfare? Never! never! unless by so doing, he could secure the means of their redemption.

Other circumstances can easily be supposed, in which it would be the duty of a slave to bear patiently and bide his time.

What good is to be secured by the running off of slaves? If there could be an exodus of the mass, the question were easily answered. But, the most that can be anticipated of good, is, the privileges secured by the fugitives themselves, and the insecurity occasioned in the tenure of slave property immediately on the borders of the free states. This effect, however, is necessarily very limited; and we apprehend little or no influence is exerted on slaves as a whole, by the flight of a few. One effect we sometimes overlook. The fugitives are generally the most intelligent, the enterprising and fearless of the slaves. It is best to diminish the number of these in the slave states; it is best to withdraw the influence which such a class must exert over the slave-population generally, and we may add, over the masters?

But, however this may be—there can be no doubt as to the duty of citizens of a free state in relation to fugitives when they do escape. They are the poorest, most friendless, most persecuted of strangers and therefore have claims upon our charities, which cannot be rejected, without incurring deep guilt. We do not regard it as the peculiar duty of abolitionists to feed them, clothe them, instruct them how to escape the blood-hounds on their track—it is the imperative duty of every citizen.

Nor is this all.—The clause of the federal constitution which binds us to be neutral between the slaveholder and the slave—to allow his claim, and suspend the operation of a law of nature, and of our own institutions, to enable him to recapture the fugitive, is an offence against humanity, a sin against God, involves us all in guilt, and should be protested against by us, without ceasing. And without doubt, it furnishes the most conclusive reason, why every man and woman in the free states should engage in active efforts for the overthrow of a system, in which they are thus deeply implicated.

Begging Votes.
The Ohio State Journal, noticing the nomination of the Hon. B. S. Cowen, for Congress, in the 15th district, remarks—

"In that district, Governor Shannon had a majority of 1,180 over Governor Corwin; and we suppose that it is for abolitionists to say who he Mr. C. shall be returned, or a Locofoco, who will oppose the tariff and vote for the annexation of Texas to the American Union."

We suppose it is for the abolitionists to say whether they will be hangers-on to the whig party, looking for the crumbs that may fall from their table, or stand erect in the dignity of men, adhering faithfully and perseveringly to their own principles, till they have secured their triumph.

Hints.
There are two things that Liberty men should avoid—parliamentary self-complacency, and uncharitable denunciation of opposing parties. We cannot but assume that our principles are true, fundamental, paramount in importance to the principles of the reigning parties—but let us remember that we are at best but unworthy advocates of them, and that we too may be inconsistent, and that we cannot vouch for the integrity of all in our own ranks.

We cannot but believe, that the Whig and Democratic parties are corrupt, loose in their principles, inconsistent, servile on the question of slavery. But, we must not forget that there are patriots belonging to them, as sincere in their patriotism as we profess to be.

On our first page is a resolution passed by a Liberty convention, in regard to the leading journals of the two parties, denouncing them as characteristic of each other in *suppression veri, et suggestio falsi*. It strikes us that this is highly unjust; and we doubt not our friends who passed it, if they had but considered it well, would have laid it aside. That there is in too many cases a suppression of truth, and a suggestion of falsehood, in relation to the movements and doctrines of abolitionists, must be admitted. That on the subject of slavery, its influence over the national councils and general welfare of the nation, there is habitual suppression of truth, at times from perfect indifference or ignorance, on the part of the leading journals of both parties, must also be admitted. And that in their political warfare, especially during seasons of high party excitement, political papers do give currency to many falsehoods, and suppress many truths in relation to each other, cannot be denied by any one familiar with partisan contentions.

But, all this will not justify the general, sweeping condemnation in the resolution, that the greatest enmulation of the leading journals of both parties, is to excel each other in suppression veri, et suggestio falsi—for this is designed to define a general character—and certainly, we are not willing to attribute such a character to any portion of the press of this country.

One of the "Natural Allies."

"One of the reasons urged by us," says the editor of the Mt. Vernon Democrat, "why the negro would not make a manly, useful, and dignified co-citizen, and mutual upholder of liberty, with white men, in this republic of ours, was, that the negro, from the peculiar composition of his character, too readily submits to the yoke of servitude, and that he does not possess that unconquerable instinct of manly freedom which distinguishes the white race. This we believe to be true. Could we be convinced of the contrary, there is no cause in which we could engage with greater ardor, or fearlessness of the consequences, than that of the benighted African!"

From this we are to infer, that were the slaves of the South to rise in determined insurrection, he would sympathize with, and aid them. We commend the sentiment of this democratic editor to his allies in the South. The forbearance of the slave is the reason why he despises him; armed resistance on the part of the slave, would secure his respect, and there would then be no cause, in which he could engage with greater ardor.

The time may yet come, when the condition on which this editor pledges his support to the slaves, will be fearfully fulfilled.

"Party Politics"—Clerical Influence.
The editor of the Western Christian Advocate appears much hurt by our notice of his visit to Kentucky, Nay, his wrath waxeth hot against us. He terms our sheet a "reckless abolition paper," and even goes so far as to talk of the "vulgarity" of the notice we took of him and his famous visit.—Well, we will not quarrel with our venerable neighbor—he shall enjoy a monopoly of hard words, and wrathful feelings. We are glad to find we agree on some important points, and hope time will see us harmonizing in still more.

The first is, he distrusts the two pro-slavery political parties. His "first political principle," as announced by himself is this—

"Each of the political parties must materially mend their ways, if our civil rights and privileges are to be preserved under the management of any one of them."

His second political principle is, "That there is great need of the interference of the Protestant Clergy in promoting the cause of Liberty; and on this account, they are called upon to do more than they ever have done."

We are glad to hear this, and hope the conscience of our neighbor will smite him, for the little he has done. We confess we thought a queer way to promote the cause of Liberty, to see a Christian minister glorifying a slaveholder, an advocate of despotism, a duelist, a horse-ra-

cer, a sabbath-breaker, a profane man. "Interference" of that kind on the part of the "Protestant clergy" we must protest against, as being calculated to promote any thing else, than sound morals or the cause of Liberty. The minister who indulges in such glorification has plunged into a deeper and dirtier "quagmire," than either the Enquirer or Philanthropist is wallowing in.

But, good men will err, and if they be not magnanimous enough to confess their faults, they may be prudent enough not to repeat them.

We thank the editor of the Christian Advocate for a most important admission in the last sentence of his article.

"Still," says he, "we will take occasion as we think best, to treat on the great moral questions connected with politics, without stepping out of our real province or asking leave of the Enquirer of any such to do so."

So then, when a great moral question becomes connected with politics, it is still a proper subject for the discussion of the preacher, is it? We hold you to that, friend of the Advocate, albeit it is in the teeth of what you have said in times past.

Unreasonable.
We have called attention to the series of conventions to be held in this state. Times and places are not yet fixed. We wish our friends of every class to attend them largely, and see to it that the abolitionism of Ohio be kept on the same old platform—to tolerate every form of anti-slavery action, whether moral suasion, political action, separate organization in church or state, denominational anti-slavery action, or free labor.—We cannot bear to see the friends of the slave turning their hands against each other. C. L. Remond is advertised as one of the speakers to attend these conventions. At a meeting in New Bedford, a report of which is given in the Liberator, Mr. Remond is thus reported—

"Mr. Remond spoke with great force and ability on the proselytic character of the political parties, and especially of the Liberty party. * * * He asserted, and the assertion was echoed back from the meeting, that an abolitionist might, with more consistency, vote with either of the other parties, *vile as they are in this respect, than with the Liberty party.*"

An Eastern audience might be found to echo such sentiments, but we are very sure no meeting of abolitionists in the West could be got up, that would be so unreasonable. Our Eastern friends may utter what sentiments they please, for we go in for the largest freedom of speech "out West," but they must expect to meet strong opposition to such sentiments as the above, from every class of abolitionists.

Texas.

We have been so engaged of late in the notice of a few subjects of great interest, that we have neglected many other topics and events of no small moment. Among these we should have referred to the armistice lately concluded between Mexico and Texas, under the auspices of Great Britain. Whether it will result in a permanent peace, is yet doubtful. Santa Anna has not committed himself on any point, but it would seem that the negotiations are to be carried on through the mediation of the British power. It is strongly suspected that her mediation will be used to promote the abolition of slavery in Texas. We confess we are humbled at the contrast Great Britain presents in this matter to our country. It became the U. States from her position to mediate peace between these two countries, and to use her influence to, for the extinction of slavery in Texas. But, our bad faith to Mexico disqualifies us for the task, and our objection to slaveholding counsels rendered us incapable, if not unwilling, to espouse the interests of Freedom.

We never can assume a lofty position on the theatre of the world, till this curse that rules and degrades us, be annihilated.

Slave Case in Illinois.
Since the slaveholder has appealed to Caesar, to Caesar he must go. He is now disposed to try whether by law, he cannot extend slavery throughout the Union. The people of the free states must watch their courts, or before they are aware, they will find slavery established among them by judicial decisions. The effort was made in this state, but thanks to the high integrity and intelligence of our Supreme Court, the right of Ohio to be free from the curse of slavery, was promptly and absolutely asserted.

Illinois has now to go through the same ordeal. A case has lately come up, on which the question will arise in the Supreme Court, whether the slaveholder may erect an altar to the Moloch of slavery, within that state. We give the following interesting account of the case, from an Illinois paper.

"To The Editor:
SIR—At the Morgan Circuit Court, on the third Monday of March, 1843, Judge Lockwood presiding, the Grand Jury returned as true, two bills of indictment—one against Julius A. Willard, the other against Samuel Willard. The indictment against J. A. Willard contained six counts—the first stating that a certain colored girl, named JULIA, being a slave, and owing labor and service in the State of Louisiana, according to the laws thereof, to certain persons in the said county mentioned; and that on the 25th day of February, 1843, at Morgan county, in the State of Illinois, Julius A. Willard, well knowing that said JULIA was a slave, did then and there unlawfully harbor and secrete the said colored girl, being a slave and owing labor and service in the State of Louisiana, and the State of Kentucky, according to the laws thereof, to one Elizabeth W. Lisle, and that on the 25th day of February, 1843, the said Julius A. Willard, through the State of Illinois, being the domicile of the said Elizabeth, and that while sojourning in the State of Illinois, with the said JULIA in her possession, the said JULIA, without the consent of said Elizabeth, escaped from her custody and possession, and that Julius A. Willard, well knowing the premises, did unlawfully harbor and secrete the said colored girl—then and there, &c.

The indictments were founded upon the 14th division, Sec. 149, of the criminal code, which provides "If any person shall harbor or secrete any negro, mulatto, or person of color, the same being a slave or servant, owing service or labor to any other persons, whether they reside in this State, or any other State or Territory or district, within the limits and under the jurisdiction of the United States, every such person so offending shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and fined not exceeding five hundred dollars, or imprisoned not exceeding six months."

Considerable time was taken in the argument. The case was opened for the defence by Mr. McClure, who was followed by Wm. Brown, Esq. The counsel for the People, Murray McConnell, Esq. replied, and Mr. Cowles concluded the argument. Mr. McClure insisted that, as slavery was local, and could not be enforced except *ad modum* under the constitution, the case involved a conflict of laws; and as Illinois was a sovereign State, her constitution must be supreme, and must prevail over a mere local positive institution—cited 6 Art. Cons. U. S.; Story, Conflict. Laws. Sec. 336; Vattel, Sec. 14 and 15; Story Sec. 7 and 8.

He also insisted that no principle of comity could sustain and give effect to slavery, within the limits of a State where slavery is prohibited—citing Story, Conflict. Laws. Sec. 522 to 538; 92, 104; Story's Commentaries, Sec. 1805.

Mr. Brown argued some technical objections to the counts; and that the State law was void, Congress having jurisdiction alone.

Mr. McConnell insisted that, by the Constitution of the United States, providing for the jurisdiction of Commerce among the several states, a right to transport slaves into any of the States of the Union was vindicable and lawful; and no state could prohibit free ingress and egress within its limits to any citizen of the United States. No state constitution could be made to exclude a citizen with property—slaves are property—cited Marshall, 476; 9 Sec. 1 Art. Cons. U. S.; 15 Peters, 188, to show, arguing, that slaves are property. He argued that by the 4th Art. 2d Sec. Cons. U. S., any citizen might carry slaves into any State and be protected in holding them; that by a principle of comity, each State should sustain the system of slavery of other states, when brought under their own jurisdiction—cited several cases where the states had legislated upon subjects belonging to Congress, as mails, counterfeiting coin, &c.

Mr. Cowles made several points: 1st. That, as the indictment did not show that the slave JULIA was a fugitive, there could be no offence as charged. As the master could only reclaim in case of an escape, there could be no harboring or secreting—cited Rees, Reps. 188; Art. 4, Sec. 2, Cons.; Act Congress, 2793.

2d. That the right of reception, is limited by the Ordinance to the thirteen original States—this being provided by compact between the people of the territory north-west of the Ohio and the people and states of the United States—and as the counts showed no escape from the original states, the indictment showed no crime—Art. 4, Sec. 2, Cons. Art. 6, Id.; Ordinance, 42d page.

3d. That the jurisdiction of this offence belongs solely to Congress, and the states have no right to legislate—12 Wendel, 311; 16 Peters, 188 vs. Pennsylvania.

4th. That as slavery is local, the courts of a State where slavery is prohibited, cannot be asked to sustain the right to a slave, and that the voluntary introduction by a person into such State with a slave makes such slave free—Law of Slavery, 308, 60, and 70, Commonwealth vs. Agis.

The Court took time; and after due consideration, held the five first counts to be defective, importing no crime, and sustained the defendant's demurrer. The Court over-ruled the demurrer to the sixth count, deciding that, by the constitution of States, the right of transit by a master with his slaves was tolerated, and the freedom of the slaves not thereby elected. The Court for the defence informed the Court that they would stand by their demurrer, and asked the Court to render judgment thereon. The Court accordingly assessed a fine of twenty dollars, remarking that the defendant supposed he was doing no act that was criminal. The case will go to the Supreme Court.

Important from England.
Much apprehension has been felt by the philanthropists of this country and England, that the clause of the late treaty between the two countries, which provides for the mutual surrender of fugitives from justice, might be perverted to the purposes of the slaveholder. We never had any fear on this point.

In a late debate in the British parliament, on two bills to carry a effect this part of the treaty, the following proceedings took place. They are conclusive.

HOUSE OF LORDS, JUNE 30.
"The Earl of Aberdeen moved the second reading of two bills relating to the apprehension of foreign offenders found in places under the dominion of the British Crown; the one having reference to offenders coming from the United States of America, the other to offenders from France. It seemed to him most reasonable that the friendly and neighboring States should mutually assist each other in the arrest of offenders; it was a duty that governments owed to each other, and every authority, including Vattel and Grotius, was in favor of the principle upon which that duty was founded. But, as the law of England at present stood, there was no power by which foreign offenders could be delivered up to the laws of their own country, unless there were a special act of Parliament introduced to that purpose; and yet he did not hesitate to say that we were bound by the most obvious rules of international law to perform the duty of delivering up offenders."

In the case of the Creole the parties might have been tried for piracy, but not for murder. Engagements, as the house were aware, had formerly been entered into upon the subject; but there had been no revival of those engagements, since the year 1806. Those engagements had been entered into between this country and America; but until the mission of his noble friend near him, nothing decisive had been concluded. It was proposed by the present measure, that offenders should be apprehended who were charged with robbery, arson, murder, forgery, assaults with intent to kill, or wherever the offence was such as would justify the apprehension and commitment for trial of the offender in his own country. He did not apprehend that from such measures any inconvenience would result, except in the case of fugitive slaves.—This was a matter which he readily admitted would require a great deal of caution and attention. It was supposed that under the bill fugitive slaves would be given up, but there was no intention of introducing any such provision. To escape from slavery was no crime; on the contrary, the condition of a slave endeavoring to escape was to be regarded with much sympathy.

He knew it had been said that the fugitive slave was guilty of robbery in carrying off the clothes he had on, which were the property of one who claimed to be the owner of the slave; but to take such clothes was no theft, neither was it a theft on the part of the fugitive slave to take away any thing which would aid him in his flight, as for example, a horse or a boat. The proposed measures he conceived to be essentially to the good understanding that ought to subsist between neighboring and friendly nations. 1st. The colonies, if any difficulties arose, the government would always have it in their power, to consult the highest legal authorities in England.—The convention which had been entered into with France on the subject, was one of a more mutual nature than that with the United States. Arrangements of this nature proposed with reference to France had been entered into at the treaty of Amiens was concluded, but since that period the convention had not been renewed. The French Government were anxious to renew that treaty, and he thought that the number of the offences to be set forth in the act might hereafter be enlarged, but for

the present it would be best to begin with the offences which had been included in the convention of 1802. The present treaty had been made for a year, with power of annulling it in either party giving six months' notice. The noble Earl concluded by moving that the two bills to which he had called attention, be read a second time.

Lord Brougham observed that the noble Earl had given a satisfactory explanation of that part of the measure which related to fugitive slaves. He did not know but that it would be necessary to introduce into the bill some explanatory clauses with reference to slavery. He would not at that stage of the measure give an opinion upon the points to which he referred, but should reserve himself for a future occasion. He should resume his seat without giving expression to the delight which he experienced at the satisfactory feeling which at present existed between the Governments of England, France, and the United States of America, on the subject under their lordships' consideration. A more barbarous state of things could not be conceived to exist than that countries whose territories almost joined each other should harbor malefactors and thus render the criminal law quite inoperative.

Lord Cottenham expressed his concurrence in the objects which the measure was intended to promote.

Lord Campbell said, that with the exception of two or three points he highly approved of the bill before the House. With regard to the Madagascar territory, he questioned whether the Crown had a right to cede that territory without the authority of an act of Parliament. That noble and learned lord concluded by observing, that with regard to the third article especially, some legislation was necessary to give full effect to the treaty.

The Earl of Aberdeen said that with regard to the third article of the treaty, it was deserving of consideration, and he would not say that any legislative provision might not be necessary; but that must take place elsewhere, not in that House. He did not give any decided opinion on the subject at present, but it would be considered elsewhere.

The Marquis of Lansdowne asked, why two crimes which were omitted in the French treaty, should be included in the American treaty, namely, robbery and arson.

The Earl of Aberdeen said, probably there was some good reason; but the two treaties had no connection with each other. The reason, perhaps, was simply this, that the treaty of Amiens had never had any operation, and when on the renewal of the treaty of Amiens, it had been proposed to include all the crimes named in the American treaty, on his (Lord Aberdeen's) suggestion, the treaty of Amiens was merely renewed with the understanding that, if it found beneficial the stipulation of the American treaty should be adopted, and extended to those and other crimes.

Lord Ashburton said, it was now settled and admitted that a slave arriving in the British territories, under any circumstances, never could be claimed or rendered liable to personal service. He had the satisfaction of thinking that there never existed more amicable feelings between the two countries since a treaty had been first concluded between them.

After a few observations from the Earl of Minto and Lord Ashburton, the bill was read a second time.

The Cotton-Conscience.
In the course of a late speech in Boston, Dr. Brisbane remarked—

"The truth is, the consciences of the people of these United States are measured by the price of cotton. Cotton is now selling in the markets in South Carolina at from four to seven cents a pound. He had raised cotton in that State, and he knew what it cost to raise it. He knew that they could not live by raising it at such prices. He had lately received letters from the South. One friend who had told him two years ago that his life would not be secure in Carolina, begs he would come back. Another says, 'I will stand by you.' Another gives the same assurance and adds, 'If you are satisfied with this, I will get dirty more to please themselves—the same thing.' Numbers of his friends at the South manifest a deeply ingrained infatuation on the subject of anti-slavery. They leg of him by all the love he hears them, not to reveal their names;—but they assure him that their minds are being enlisted in this matter. Now how comes all this about? It is throughout the operation of this cotton-conscience. The prospect was that this cotton-conscience might yet produce great results for the slaves in this country."

There is doubtless much truth in this. But, we must not overlook the fact, that man is a creature of various motives. He is not a mass of selfishness, or benevolence alone. He has a cotton-conscience, it is true, but also a righteous conscience. While some in the South have lost their zeal for slavery, owing to the fall in the price of cotton, and many have been disposed from the same cause to look more candidly at their true position, still let us hope, that not a few are beginning to feel the force of higher motives.

Anglo-Saxon Slavery.
The Mt. Vernon Democrat, animadverting upon the communication of a correspondent, writing in defence of the rights of the negro race, says—

"Iut our correspondent, though a gentleman of extensive and varied learning, has not been able to cite one solitary example of white slavery, possessing the peculiar traits of servitude, which have characterized the negro-slavery of the West Indies, and the South for the last two centuries."

All that correspondent has to do, is to cite the slavery of the far-famed Anglo-Saxon race, a slavery as sly and absolute, as that of the negro slave. And for proof, let him refer the inexperienced editor of the Democrat to Turner's Anglo-Saxon history, where he will learn that, (if he is himself of the Anglo-Saxon breed,) he has descended from as servile, degraded a stock as the African slaves.

